case all of the facts were carefully considered by both courts (Petition, Appendices A and C), and they clearly demonstrated the absence of any cause of action. Petitioner's accusation that the Second Circuit deliberately applied "a double standard" to this case (p. 11) is outrageous and contemptuous.

Petitioner's cited Thonen v. Jenkins, 491 F.2d 722 (4th Cir., 1973) and Thomas v. Board of Ed., Granville Cent. Sch. Dist., 607 F.2d 1043 (2nd Cir., 1979), cert. den., 48 L.W. 3536 (2/19/80) (Petition, p.12), both involved true expressions of speech contained in student publications, not offensive obscenities, and indicate no "conflict" whatsoever with the decision below. In Thonen, the court, citing Healy v. James, 408 U.S. 169, confirmed the right even of a university to "'enforce regulations as to the time, place and manner of speech'" (491 F.2d at 723). In Thomas, supra, the court citing Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503, 509 (1969), carefully distinguished cases which, like the instant one, "involved expression within the school itself," where the courts are most reluctant to intervene (607 F.2d at 1050).

CONCLUSION

The decision below was clearly correct. Furthermore, there is not the slightest ground for the granting of certiorari, since the entire claim is trivial, the "Questions Presented" have been concocted, the courts below acted correctly and soundly, and the decision below does not conflict, but is in full accord, with all prior decisions, in this Court as well as all courts of appeal.

This petition should be denied, with costs.

Respectfully submitted,

MURRAY STEYER
STEYER & SIROTA, ESQS.
Attorneys for Respondents
235 Main Street
White Plains, NY 10601
(914) 428-7600

June 1980